

IMAC QA SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES
January 24, 2005

Members Present: John Haine, DHFS; Lisa Hanson, DHFS; Pam Lohaus, DHFS; Brian Fangmeier, DHFS; Marcia Williamson, DHFS; Chris Elms, Dane County; Marilyn Rudd, DHFS

Via Conference Call: Vickie Jessup, DHFS; Jackie Bennett, Racine County; Joanne Ator, Door County

Absent: Kathy Judd, Dane County; **Jacale** Coutant, Milwaukee County; Bernadette Connolly, DHFS

Agenda Items for this month's meeting:

I. Meeting Minutes Review: The meeting minutes from the November 24, 2004 meeting were reviewed and approved.

II. Food Stamp 2nd party review process-discussion. Plan is to send out the sample of what is recommended review items for the 2nd party review via the Area Coordinators. Rather not send out as a memo, as that would require too much time to get approved as a form.

During discussion as how good it works, it was brought up that most counties are behind in entering the information but have done the work. Each county needs to get a system in place to enter into the 2nd party review screens. It was agreed that the "tool" works well and counties like it. They just don't have enough time to get all the info into the system.

Jackie Bennett stated Racine county has 2 staff doing the QA's but time is difficult due to their other duties. She also stated the reviewers are finding its very time consuming going way back to intake month. They usually just QC the selected month and the next month.

They are finding it difficult to QA just the 5 error producers; more used to QA the entire case. Having difficulty pulling the prorated benefit amount for intake month.

Top 5 error producers based on the 2004 Error Data:

- Wages and Salary's
- Shelter
- Household Composition
- Shelter and utilities allowance
- Child Support.

OP memo stresses not ignoring counties initiatives if they are doing other procedures. Data is needed timely; the question is how to help counties get data entered after cases have been QA'd. Flexibility is needed all the way around in recognizing payment accuracy on the counties levels. Do counties need more training on how to use this tool? John wants to attend regional meeting to discuss this issue.

III. Error Rate: Overall state un-regressed error rate for 2004 is 6.60%. 2003 was 9 % and 2002 was 12.3%. Milwaukee's 2004 error rate was their lowest ever at 9.1%. 2 counties will liability exposure was Rock and Milwaukee.

Federal law dramatically changes the sanction methodology. Workload and finance committee decided only large counties with more than 30 pulls could potentially have a liability. Hopefully in 2005 we could not have a liability. National average through Aug 2004 was 5.4%. Overall, a good year, however, we may still receive a sanction.

QA has a goal to ensure worker who caused error need to see the outcome. With many counties, cases get passed around and the worker causing error often never sees the error.

IV. MER Issues: Marilyn states the MER's give us a lot of good information but FNS wants it revised. WI's MER plan appears to be smaller than other states. Many states spend a month at each agency reviewing many different aspects of their workload. Most states have 5-10 staff who's largest part of their job responsibilities is MER. WI has just Marilyn Rudd and 5 Area Coordinators who have many other responsibilities. WI primarily uses QC reviews of cases. We are doing a great job as our error rate has dramatically dropped, FNS is requiring more time be spent on MER's.

Question is why can't we use cases that have been QC'd? We don't yet know the states response to this issue. WI doesn't have the staff or money to implement all the FNS requirements. Feds do not expect changes to start in 05 but expect some changes would need to be made by 06. Marilyn is optimistic that our past record should speak for itself as our rates have dropped in the past 3 years

Marilyn would like to see this committee have a discussion on QA plans for 06. It would hinge on budget and monies to counties.

Submitted by Chris Elms, Dane County